

DD/S-60-4222

30 November 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Deputy Director (Support) Response to the
Inspector General's Survey of the CIA
Training Program, August 1960

1. The Inspector General's Survey of the CIA Training Program, August 1960 has been studied by the Chiefs of Staffs and Offices of the Deputy Director (Support). Their general reaction, and mine, is that this very comprehensive and instructive survey of CIA training policies and practices is both timely and useful. Many of the points that it raises are not new, but this Survey provides us an opportunity to re-examine them. I should like first to make some general observations affecting our Agency training program as a whole and then, in individual attachments--Tabs 1 through 35 inclusive--to present our comments on the specific recommendations made in the Survey. I have chosen not to comment, however, on the recommendations concerning Project [REDACTED] 25X1A2g

2. My general observations are as follows. While each subject is discussed in the Survey, I believe that they deserve special emphasis.

DOC	1	REV DATE	19/12/80	BY	018995
ORIG COMP			11	TYPE	01
ORIG CLASS	S	PAGES	36	REV CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	HR	10-2

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

a. Agency Training--"Permissive" or "Planned"?

Basic to planning, programing, and staffing our Agency training program are answers by command and management to this question: "Who shall be trained in what knowledge or skills, when, and for what purpose?"

Our present and not inconsiderable array of training--formal OTR courses, component-conducted instruction, on-the-job training, and external training--represents an energetic response to specific training requirements. But at the same time, as the Inspector General points out, enrollments in some courses have been irregular and courses have had to be canceled or suspended for lack of sufficient numbers of students.

There are apparent differences of opinion as to the need for various levels of training. For example, some of our new professionals (JOT's) receive intensive and comprehensive basic training before going into on-the-job training; others (junior economists for [REDACTED] receive 25X1A8a only a short orientation but not basic intelligence training to complement the substantive knowledge acquired in college and elsewhere. As a further example, the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Inspector General strongly recommends the establishment of a mid-career training program, and OTR has had such a course on the drawing board; nevertheless, there has been no stated requirement for this level and type of training from the Deputy Directorates.

The Agency attitude toward participation in training also varies. While individual career services have set training standards related to positions, for the most part training has been permissive rather than planned or directed. To repeat, there are exceptions, but the net result is an uneven approach to training. The "five per cent in training" rule succeeded in bringing about a greater participation in training, to be sure, but even so, performance was uneven.

Lacking enforced or enforceable training standards, the individual supervisor determines what training shall be accomplished. A branch chief who is training-minded, with or without a five per cent rule, will make a strenuous effort to see that his personnel receive the maximum training. But another branch chief may take the position that the best--or the only--way to learn is by doing. A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

proof of the inadequacy of the present system of permissive training policy is the sorry spectacle of instructors and training liaison officers having to drum up candidates for courses which have been established in response to a Deputy Director's request.

For a planned or directed training policy, what should be our overall objectives? How much training do we need and how much can we afford, not only in terms of dollars but also of time? How can we make a planned system work? I am not sure that we or any other agency can arrive at the Answer, but I think we can make a start. And whatever we arrive at now, there must be continuing review of present and future requirements and of our methods for meeting them.

Our Answer to the problem of training must be tied in with our career service and career development policies and programs. It seems safe to assume that today's demands call for the development of generalists who have a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of Intelligence and Operations and are capable of directing and coordinating programs of broad scope, and experts who

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

can deal with detailed complexities and meet high professional standards in very specialized fields. And many of our generalists will also possess some specialized skills.

Next, we will no doubt continue to make allowance for lateral entries of very essential experts and technicians into our Agency at various levels, but we should look to our JOT Program as the primary source of new, young general professionals. There will continue to be a variety of opportunities for career advancement of both generalists and specialists, and for movement between "ladders of advancement" in order to fill the need for various combinations of skills--including general executive talents at the higher levels.

I suggest that we approach the problem of planned or directed training in three ways:

(1) First, professionals should be assigned to general training courses at specified points during their careers--orientation and basic training, mid-career training, and senior officer training.

(2) Second, professionals should be assigned to language, area, and functional training courses on the basis of the training prerequisites for positions to which they are assigned.

(3) Third, professionals should be encouraged to continue their own personal intellectual interests and self-development with or without Agency sponsorship or assistance, as the individual case warrants.

I believe that such an approach is practicable with basically our present training structure. Where more drastic action is required, however, is in the establishment of training standards and prerequisites for specific positions--or tasks--and in the appointment, where this is not now the case, of responsible senior professionals as component or unit training officers. We can expect no marked improvement in our Agency training program so long as training is permissive.

b. The Junior Officer Training Concept

Our task is made simpler if we can reach agreement on a concept of orientation and basic training for our new, junior professionals.

I agree with the Inspector General in the concept of a single service in CIA--that is, in the self-identification of the professional as a CIA Intelligence Officer, whether he is assigned to the DD/P, DD/I, or DD/S as a generalist or as a specialist. And I believe that all new, junior professionals should be gotten off to the same start in their Agency careers in terms of their initial orientation, indoctrination, and familiarization with the business of Intelligence and CIA missions and functions.

On the other hand, I believe that we must stick to our present, proven JOTP concepts and practices and admit to the essential differences between JOT's and those other highly desirable young people who are employed because of their peculiar, specialized qualifications. We need both, and we need flexibility to attract, recruit, hire, and to train both for the variety of tasks to be performed.

To deal with this problem, and at the same time to protect the vital asset which our JOTP represents, we have formed a special task force comprised of the following officers:

OTR

Matthew Baird



25X1A9a

SSA-DD/S

O/Personnel

Emmett Echols



25X1A9a

DD/P

DD/I

This group will meet until the problem is resolved.

c. Rotational Assignments to OTR

I would like now to turn to the problem of the quality of OTR-conducted training and to the problem of selection and placement of JOT's. To deal with both of these, the Inspector General has recommended the establishment of certain new boards and panels comprised of representatives of the Deputy Directorates. While undoubtedly these could serve a useful purpose, I really do not believe that these measures are as necessary or as potentially effective as the rotational assignment of selected, experienced officers from the Deputy Directorates to OTR in regularly established positions as instructors, staff officers, and as training officers on the JOT Program Staff.

On the basis of long experience I have become convinced that a key factor in the development of more efficient instructors in the growing complexity of Agency skills and techniques is the rotational assignment of instructors. By this I mean a continuing exchange of personnel between OTR and the Components, particularly the Clandestine Services. Through such exchange, planned on a career development basis for the individuals concerned, and with individuals selected on the basis of qualifications, the Component officer brings to OTR his experience and expertise in his particular field and applies these to a related area of instruction. The OTR instructor, meanwhile, is brought up to date on current operating practices in his field and enriches his background experience and capabilities for his next tour as a career instructor. While the OTR instructor is serving with an operating component, he is expected to be and is a producing member of that component.

The matter of current, operational doctrine also is affected by the rotational assignment. No matter how much our system for obtaining operating doctrine is improved, its

translation into realistic training doctrine and effective instruction is made more positive if the instructor is personally experienced in the type of activity involved.

Similarly, communication between OTR and the Components is facilitated and OTR plans and programs are made more realistic if some of OTR's staff positions are filled by officers on rotational tours from the Components. The case of the JOTP staff is particularly important.

Training officers assigned to the JOTP Staff work under the close and continuing supervision of the Chief, JOTP who has long experience in this position. The training officer comes to know intimately the JOT's assigned him. He has access to their complete background files, he interviews them as applicants, recommends their acceptance or rejection. He briefs and counsels them after entry on duty, is their advisor during the training period, follows their progress through the courses of instruction, observes their attitudes and aptitudes, and recommends the direction their careers should take. He keeps in very close touch with career

service panels, divisions, and branches; recommends and assists in placement; and briefs both JOT and new supervisor when the JOT enters on-the-job training in the Component. If this training officer is representative of his Component, if he has the confidence of his Component and is carefully selected for this responsible assignment, he is in an ideal position to select candidates of the kind needed by his Component and to guide them effectively during their initial, critical training period. He can be far more effective than a panel dealing with files and reports.

The importance of this concept of exchange of personnel to the effective conduct of OTR's training responsibilities cannot be emphasized enough; it is OTR's life blood. On the one hand, it is the assurance of continuity and currency; on the other, it is the essential ingredient to the development of a career corps of experienced instructors and managers and planners of Agency training activities. Although this concept has appeared to be accepted and to be working successfully, I am deeply alarmed at the growing evidence that it will

not continue to the extent that it must if we are to have an improved training program.

d. The Role of the Director of Training

The Director of Training and I do not concur in the Inspector General's statement that "the subordination of the Office of Training to the DD/S has also materially limited the power of the Director of Training to develop and control unified Agency training policy." As Director of Training, he is responsible to the Deputy Director (Support). In this capacity he and his Office, under my direction, are immediately responsive to training requirements levied by any office or Deputy Directorate. He exercises staff responsibility for the Agency in his functional specialty, and develops unified Agency training policy. I firmly believe that he makes as great a contribution to improving our Agency training program as is permitted by the Deputy Directorates, and I do not believe that he would have any more real control of the Deputy Directorates if he were placed in any other organizational alignment. I furthermore do not believe that he should exercise much more real control of the

Deputy Directorates in his staff specialty. The ever increasing degree of coordination of Agency-wide training by the Director of Training, particularly during the last five years as a part of the DD/S organization, is a significant fact, as the Inspector General's report recognizes.

e. Manpower and Money Required

It should be noted that approval and implementation of many of the recommendations presented in the Survey would result in an increased commitment of Agency funds and/or manpower for training purposes. The Agency should not spin its wheels by approving proposals which would significantly increase personnel and costs without considering simultaneously where the additional personnel and money are coming from. This consideration must be a factor in the review of the Survey's recommendations, separately and as a whole.

3. In conclusion, the Survey has served to stimulate a renewed interest in training and to identify problems of mutual concern which need to be resolved if we are to continue to develop and to improve our training program. This program must clearly meet the present and

future needs of the Agency and, at the same time, it must be in proper balance and perspective in terms of the funds and personnel devoted to it. I and my Staffs and Offices feel a particular responsibility for the development and implementation of such a program. We look forward to the follow-up Survey within an appropriate period of time.



FOIAb3b

L. K. WHITE
Deputy Director (Support)